

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

RECEIVED

JAN 17 2005

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITYTo:
JANE MASSEY LICATA
LICATA & TYRRELL P.C.
66 E. MAIN STREET
MARLTON, NJ 08053Docket System
Status Report
Docket Book

entered NP

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Date of Mailing
(day/month/year)

13 JAN 2005

Applicant's or agent's file reference

UMD-0012

REPLY DUE

within 1 months/days from
the above date of mailing

International application No.

PCT/US03/05041

International filing date (day/month/year)

21 February 2003 (21.02.2003)

Priority date (day/month/year)

21 February 2002 (21.02.2002)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): A61K 38/00; C07K 1/00, 14/00, 17/00 and US Cl.: 530/324, 350

Applicant

UNIVERSITY OF MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY OF NEW JERSEY

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☒ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.**When?** See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~**How?** By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.**Also** For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6**If no reply is filed**, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 21 June 2004(21.06.2004).

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

Jeffrey Stucker

Telephone No. 571.272.1600

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-11, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 12 and 13, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages 1-2, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☒ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☒ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☒ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☒ the description, pages NONE
- ☒ the claims, Nos. NONE
- ☒ the drawings, sheets/fig NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

** Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."*

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US03/05041

III. Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1. The question whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application,

☒ claims Nos. 4-19

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require international preliminary examination (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 4-19.

2. A written opinion cannot be drawn due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:

☐ the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.

☐ the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/05041

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-3</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-3</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-3</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-3 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by NCBI database accession No. P05908. The prior art sequence is a variant of Tat with asparagine in position 23. Therefore, the claims are anticipated by the prior art.

Claims 1-3 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over NCBI database accession No. P05908. The claimed invention is known in the art cannot be said to have an inventive step.

Claims 1-3 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US03/05041

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.